

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 25-31 are allowed. Applicant further wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of November 10, 2009, with Mark A. Dalla Valle, Reg. #34,147.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,357,617 (Davis). Independent claim 1 has been amended hereinabove to clarify that the pipeline has a depth of a plurality of program instruction execution stages. As discussed with the Examiner and as agreed by the Examiner during the telephone interview, this distinguishes the presently claimed invention, in which such plurality of program instruction execution stages the program instructions (including any “source fetch” instructions) are executed, over the disclosed apparatus of Davis, in which any fetching or decoding of instructions is performed outside of the single program instruction execution stage.

Claims 3, 5, 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,710 (Eickemeyer). Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and are also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Nguyen. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Narayanaswami. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and are also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 14, 16, 17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Krishna. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis and Krishna in view of Eickemeyer. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis and Krishna in view of Nguyen. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Joffe in view of Krishna. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the “Response to Arguments” and respectfully submits that the Joffe reference does not appear to teach what is alleged. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions, namely col. 2, lns. 29-39 and col. 10, lns. 19-32 do not describe checking to see if all of the programs are completed. The cited portion of Joffe upon which the rejection appears to depend describes checking to see if the Suspend and Wait signals are deasserted, in which case the PC register is changed to point to the

next instruction. In other words, in accordance with the remarks of the previous amendment, this is done for a single program. Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions any indication that Joffe looks to see if all of the plurality of programs are completed. It appears that Joffe merely describes in the cited portions that when the Suspend and Wait signals are deasserted, operation proceeds to the next instruction. It is not seen where it is described or even suggested how, upon deassertion of the Suspend and Wait signals, operation is to then exit the current program and proceed on to another program. Accordingly, since the reference does not teach what has been alleged, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining pending claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 16, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 North LaSalle  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
312/609-7500  
312/609-5005 Facsimile